

Note to reviewers: Draft short-listing criteria were reviewed at the April 16, 2007 Conservation Strategy Workgroup meeting. This version includes revisions to the criteria recommended at the workgroup meeting.

Application of the following draft short-listing criteria are intended to provide an assessment of the relative effectiveness of draft BDCP Conservation Strategy Alternatives (CSAs) and associated elements. The intended outcome of applying the criteria to each of the CSAs is to provide the Conservation Strategy Workgroup with the information necessary to identify a short-list of CSAs that will be further developed. It is intended that the short-listed CSAs will represent a clearly defined range of differing approaches to achieving the BDCP planning goals and objectives. The further-defined short-listed CSAs will then be evaluated using a different and more rigorous set of criteria to craft the proposed BDCP Conservation Strategy Framework.

The draft short-listing criteria presented below were developed based on the BDCP Planning Agreement (i.e., the Planning Agreement Planning Goals [section 3] and Preliminary Conservation Objectives [section 6]; draft BDCP Conservation Objectives previously reviewed by the Conservation Strategy Workgroup; previously developed criteria for evaluating approaches to conserving the Delta (Mount et. al. 2006)¹; and criteria suggested by BDCP participants. It is anticipated that each of the CSAs will be qualitatively assessed against the criteria in narrative form. The criteria will be applied using the professional judgment of experts based on the present understanding of how the Bay-Delta ecosystem operates. The level of certainty regarding conclusions will be included in the qualitative narrative for each criterion. The CSAs are not expected to conflict with the policies and goals of the Fishery Agencies, however, any potential for such conflicts will be described as identified through application of the criteria.

Draft Short-Listing Criteria (Version 2)

Biological Criteria

1. Relative degree to which the CSA would reduce species mortality attributable to non-natural mortality sources for each of the covered fish species (BDCP Conservation Objective).
2. Relative degree to which the CSA would provide water quality conditions necessary to enhance species production (reproduction, growth, and survival), abundance, and distribution for each of the covered fish species (BDCP Conservation Objective).
3. Relative degree to which the CSA would increase habitat quality, quantity, accessibility, and diversity to enhance and sustain species production (reproduction, growth, and survival), abundance, and distribution, and to improve the resiliency of species populations to environmental change for each of the covered fish species (BDCP Conservation Objective).
4. Relative degree to which the CSA would increase food quality, quantity, and accessibility (e.g., phytoplankton, zooplankton, macro-invertebrates, forage fish) to enhance species production (reproduction, growth, survival, abundance) for each of the covered fish species (BDCP Conservation Objective).

¹ Mount, Jeffrey, Robert Twiss, and Richard M. Adams. 2006. *The Role of Science in the Delta Visioning Process: A report of the Delta Science Panel of the CALFED Science Program*. Available online at http://science.calwater.ca.gov/pdf/CSP_delta_vision_process_Twiss_062306.pdf

5. Relative degree to which the CSA would reduce the abundance of non-native competitors and predators to increase native species production, abundance, and distribution for each of the covered fish species (BDCP Conservation Objective).
6. Relative degree to which the CSA addresses important stressors affecting each of the covered fish species.
7. Relative degree to which the CSA can be implemented within a timeframe to meet the near-term needs of each covered fish species (post BDCP authorization).

Planning Criteria

8. Relative degree to which the CSA allows for the implementation of the covered activities such that the goals and purposes of the covered activities can be achieved.
9. The relative feasibility and practicability of the CSA, including the ability to fund, engineer, and implement.
10. Relative costs (including infrastructure, operations, and management) associated with implementing the CSA.

Flexibility/Durability/Sustainability Criteria

11. Relative degree of the CSA to withstand the effects of climate change (e.g. sea level rise, changes in runoff), seismic events, subsidence of Delta islands, and other large-scale changes to the Delta.
12. Relative degree to which the CSA could improve ecosystem processes that support the long term needs of each of the covered species and their habitats with minimal future input of resources.
13. Relative degree of adaptability of the CSA to address needs of covered fish species over time.
14. Relative degree of reversibility of the CSA once implemented.

Other Resource Impacts Criteria

15. Relative degree to which the CSA avoids impacts on the distribution and abundance of other (non-covered) native species in the BDCP Planning Area.
16. Relative degree to which the CSA avoids impacts on the human environment.
17. Relative degree of risk of the CSA causing impacts on sensitive species and habitats in areas outside of the BDCP Planning Area.